

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/626,476	07/23/2003	Paul W. Skinner	021028-000120US	1328
37490	7590 12/01/2005		EXAMI	NER
CARPENTER & KULAS, LLP			NGUYEN,	DINH Q
1900 EMBARCADERO ROAD SUITE 109 PALO ALTO, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		-70 L S			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/626,476	SKINNER, PAUL W.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Dinh Q. Nguyen	3752			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 A	August 2005.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 35-57 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-57 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyanction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in A Drity documents have been Au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

6) Other: ____.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,476

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 35-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall. III in view of Otten et al.

Hall, III discloses a vegetation dispensing device comprising: a conduit 190 with a channel 195 (see figure 14), an outlet 232 for conveying a substance 206a-c, a sensor 200 for sensing growing conditions and communicated with the conduit 231 via controller 10 (see figure 15), a flow control 205 for regulating an amount of substance, a microprocessor control system 10, the plurality of sensors such as soil moisture, ground temperature, ion concentration (as disclosed in column 15, lines 34-60). Hall, III does not disclose the sensor being coupled to the conduit. However, Otten et al. discloses a fluid control device with fluid flowing conduit 23 with sensor 137 couple to the conduit 23 for sensing flowing conditions and relay signals to processor 37 (see figure 15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to configure the device of Hall, III with a sensor being coupled to the conduit as suggested by Otten et al. Doing so would provide a way to control fluid dispensing within the system (see Otten's column 1, lines 29+)

Application/Control Number: 10/626,476 Page 3

Art Unit: 3752

With respect to claims 41, 43-47, 50, 52, and 53, Hall, III in view of Otten et al. do not disclose expressly the sensors such as leaf wetness sensor, insect sensor, DNA sensor, sugar accumulation sensor, pheromone sensor or protein sensor etc. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Hall, III device with the above sensors, because Applicant has not disclosed that the above sensors provides an advantage, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any of the above sensors because they provide a way to monitor a condition of vegetation. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Hall, III and Chaplinsky to obtain the invention as specified in claims 41, 43-47, 50, 52, and 53. Furthermore, it is obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the Hall, III and Otten et al. device with any type of sensors (see Hall, III column 15, lines 43-45).

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 35-57 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 3752

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Scherbel can be reached on 571-272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dinh Q Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3752

dqn